

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

| APPLICATION NO.                                      | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/493,917   | 01/28/2000      | Chris Warren Patten  | 50N3426(3020/5)     | 2820             |  |
| 27774  | 7590 06/07/2004 |                      | EXAM                | EXAMINER         |  |
| MAYER, FORTKORT & WILLIAMS, PC 251 NORTH AVENUE WEST |                 |                      | YENKE, BRIAN P      |                  |  |
| 2ND FLOO   |                 |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| WESTFIEL   | D, NJ 07090     |                      | 2614                | 15               |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| Advisory Action  | 09/493,917   | PATTEN ET AL.   |  |
| •  | Examiner   | Art Unit  |  |
| ·  | BRIAN P. YENKE   | 2614  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the c  | correspondence add  | ress                                     |
| THE REPLY FILED 11 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appetexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  | void abandonment of this application in the same of th | cation. A proper re-                                      | ply to a cation in                       |
| PERIOD FOR RE  | PLY [check either a) or b)]  |   |  |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  | isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th<br>an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o   | f the final rejection.                                    |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | sion and the corresponding amount of the<br>statutory period for reply originally set in   | fee. The appropriate extended the final Office action; or | tension fee under<br>(2) as set forth in |
| <ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li> </ol>   | s Brief must be filed within the p<br>R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal (  | period set forth in of the appeal.                        |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be  | ecause:  |   |  |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further   | er consideration and/or search (   | (see NOTE below);   |  |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note to  | pelow);  |   |  |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application i<br>issues for appeal; and/or  | in better form for appeal by mat   | erially reducing or s                                     | simplifying the                          |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancel  | ing a corresponding number of  | finally rejected clair                                    | ms.                                      |
| NOTE:  |  |   |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection  | tion(s):   |   |  |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>   | be allowable if submitted in a s   | eparate, timely filed                                     | d amendment                              |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se   | r reconsideration has been consecution of the continuation of the  | sidered but does NC                                       | OT place the                             |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.  | cause it is not directed SOLELY  | to issues which we  | ere newly                                |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we  | c(s) a)  will not be entered or bould be rejected is provided belo   | ) will be entered<br>ow or appended.                      | and an                                   |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |  |   |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |  |   |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |  |   |  |
| Claim(s) rejected:   |  |   | •  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |  |   |  |
| 8. $\square$ The drawing correction filed on is a) $\square$ app   | roved or b) disapproved by   | the Examiner  |  |
| 9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme   | nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).  |   | 10                                       |
| 0.⊠ Other: <u><i>PTO-892</i></u>   |  | BRIAN P. YENKE<br>Primary Examiner                        | Jek                                      |
|  |  | Art Unit: 2614  | $\bigcup$                                |

obtains unexpected results.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant states that the examiner has failed to state a prima facie case of obviousness, where applicant believes the examiner is confusing an end result with the claimed manner of achieving the result. Initially the examiner would like to rely on the applicant's own disclosure which specifically states (page 5, line 17-19) "The movement of the image can be in the form of shifting the entire image towards the sensor, or alternatively, stretching the image so that the edges of the image can be detected by the sensors." The examiner relied on Teraoka which discloses movement of the image by stretching/compressing the image to maintain the center portion of the original signal. Given the broadest interpretation, the examiner interpreted the claims as displaying an image which has been moved where the displayed image is in its the original size. Regarding the applicant's statement of movement withouth increasing any of the dimensions. The question of obviousness is whether movement of an image without changing the size (increasing) or movement by changing the size are patentably distinct from each other. The examiner believes the two are not patentably distinct since they are obvious variations/modifications of performing the same function as stated in the applicant's disclosure, which states that movement can be performed in either manner. Thus the examiner maintains the

rejection since the movement of an image by either changing or not changing the size, derive the same results, where neither method